

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

tread

Claims 1-13 and 15-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohsawa (U.S. 2001/0032691) and optionally Heinen '100 (GB 2,363,100) or Heinen '835 (U.S. 6,415,835). Independent claims 1, 16, and 17 are amended above to further define the configuration of the claimed projection, namely the second side (2') forming with the outer surface (S1) an undercut extending beneath the apex (P). Such an undercut, as acknowledged by the Examiner is not found or suggested in any of the cited references. The undercut defines a channel for the purpose of contained channeling of water between the shorter projection side and the surface from which the projection extends. Such structure patentably defines over the collective cited art which shows projections that form a non-undercut, v-shaped channel lacking the depth and defined channel formed by the projection undercut of the subject invention. Entry of the amendments and allowance of all claims is, therefore, requested.

sidewall/tread

Claims 1-8, 10-16 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kemp (US 6,253,815) and optionally Ohsawa (US 2001/0032691). As discussed above, independent claims 1, 16, and 17 are amended above to further define the configuration of the claimed projection, namely the second side (2') forming with the outer surface (S1) an undercut extending beneath the apex (P). Such an undercut, as acknowledged by the Examiner is not found or suggested in any of the cited references. The undercut defines a channel for the purpose of contained channeling of water between the shorter projection side and the surface from which the projection extends. Such structure patentably defines over the collective cited art which shows projections that form a non-undercut, v-shaped channel lacking the depth and defined channel formed by the projection undercut of the subject invention. Entry of the amendments and allowance of all claims is, therefore, requested.

Claim 9 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kemp (U.S. 6,253,815) and optionally Ohsawa (US 2001/0032691) as applied above and further in view of Attinello et al (US 5,645,660). For the reasons above, Applicant submits that no cited reference teaches or suggests a projection forming an undercut channel.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that the invention as claimed is patentably distinct over the cited art. A reconsideration of the application and an expeditious indication of allowance of all pending claims are, accordingly, requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard B. O'Planick – Reg. No. 29,096
Attorney for Applicants

The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company
Department 823
1144 East Market Street
Akron, Ohio 44316-0001
Telephone: (330) 796-5240
Facsimile: (330) 796-9018